



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

“And men shall be blessed in him,
 “All nations shall call him happy,”

conceals the true meaning of the passage, in which the original promise to Abraham and Israel is verbally cited, amplified, and applied to the king sitting upon the eternal throne of David.

Similar phenomena abound in the psalms and the prophetic books, especially in the passages that the New Testament and Israelitish and Christian tradition regard as Messianic. They are especially worthy of careful study.

Various Topics.

BY PROF. FREDERIC GARDINER.

I.

ON HEB. X. 20. — *διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.*¹

THE meaning of this passage, if we confine ourselves to the strict construction of the Greek words, is plain. The *τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ* is marked by the *τοῦτ' ἔστι* as expegetical of *καταπετάσματος*, is in apposition with it, and having no preposition of its own, must be governed by the *διὰ* of the *τοῦ καταπετάσματος*. This veil was that which shut out from view and from access the Holy of holies, and was rent at the moment of our Lord's death. In the previous chapter (vs. 8) we are told that the Holy Ghost thus signified “that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing.” The *διὰ* then must be local and not instrumental, and on the face of it, it would be grammatically insufferable to change its meaning from local where it is expressed, to instrumental where it is implied in the same clause.

We are brought then to the strange conclusion, which is accepted by the great majority of commentators, that the *σάρξ* of our Lord is here represented as an obstacle to His and to our entrance into heaven, as something which, so far from being the very means of access, was a bar against it, and required to be removed. In the effort to make this idea intelligible some writers insist upon the distinction between *σάρξ* and *σῶμα*, and hold that the *σάρξ* represents only that purely earthly part of our Lord's nature which could not pass into

¹ Read in June.

the heavens but was left behind at His death upon the cross, and they refer to the saying in 1 Cor. xv. 50 that *σάρξ καὶ αἷμα* cannot inherit the kingdom of God. Undoubtedly *σάρξ* is often used in such a sense, particularly in the writings of St. Paul; but I do not know that it is ever so used in connection with the person of our Lord. In this sense it almost always implies something of evil, something belonging to our unregenerated nature, something which could not be attributed to our Lord without incongruity. When He uses it in reference to Himself, as He does six times in Jno. vi., it is with a very different meaning, all being summed up in the saying (vs. 51 *Revis.*) "the bread which I will give is *ἡ σὰρξ μου*, for the life of the world." But however this may be, it was certainly something which was not laid aside at His death; for after His resurrection He proves to the disciples the reality of His body by saying (Lk. xxiv. 39), "A spirit hath not *σάρκα* and bones as ye see me have." If then the *σάρξ* was a bar to His entrance into heaven, it still remained after His death and resurrection.

Again: the association is so close between *σάρξ* and *αἷμα* that it is hard to conceive of one being an instrument and the other an obstacle. But the *αἷμα* of Christ is constantly throughout the N. T. represented as the instrument of His victory over sin. Particularly in the previous chapter of this Epistle, it is said (vs. 11, 12 *Revis.*) "Christ having come a High Priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, He entered in once for all into the Holy place [the Holy of holies], having obtained eternal redemption." Here, with the same symbolism of the temple, the *αἷμα* of Christ is made the means of His passing into heaven, and in the very verse preceding our passage and forming a part of the same sentence, the same symbolism and instrumentality is repeated: "The entrance into the Holy of holies by the *αἷμα* of Jesus." In both these cases the instrumentality is marked by the dative with *ἐν*. We should naturally expect the genitive of the closely related *σαρκός* with *διὰ* to have here the same instrumental force.

May it not be possible, without violence to the Greek construction, to obtain in the passage before us a sense more in accordance with the analogy of Scripture, and more consonant to what we should have expected, than that given by the majority of the commentators?

It is enough merely to allude in passing to those Patristic and Mediæval interpretations by which the *σάρξ* of our Lord was made

the *καταπέτασμα* of His divinity, veiling it from the eyes of men but removed with His passage into the heavens. But besides what has been already said of the use of *σάρξ* in connection with our Lord, and especially with His body after the resurrection, such truth as might be conveyed by this interpretation is not germane to the thought of the Apostle here. He is speaking of the new and living way into the Holiest, consecrated for us by the blood of Jesus, and His death is viewed instrumentally, and in the midst of this thought it would be incongruous to speak of His flesh as an obstruction or hindrance—an idea which nowhere appears in Scripture. Neither is it needful to speak of those interpretations of commentators of the Roman Church who make the *σάρξ* the substance given to the faithful in the Eucharist *veiled* under the appearance of the bread. Unlike as these interpretations are in other respects, they agree in making a play upon the word *veil* and taking it, not as an absolute shutting out of the Holy of holies, but as a mere obscuring of it to our view, without much regard to the connection of the thought.

It is a familiar fact that the figures and similes of Scripture are often not carried out with that perfect unity which the laws of modern and Western composition require. There is sometimes a certain gliding of the expression from the standpoint at the beginning to a somewhat different one as the sentence or the paragraph flows on. In the wonderful parable of the Sower, as given by St. Matthew, there is a certain confusion in expression between the seed sown and the person in whose heart it is sown, while yet the general teaching is transparently clear. In St. Paul's illustration of grafting the wild olive into the good tree, he has exactly reversed the custom of the husbandman, though his main point of the grafting is most happily illustrated.

So, too, forms of expression are occasionally used in the Greek of the N. T., as I suppose in all other languages, in which the exact sense of the words is the precise opposite of the plain intent of the writer. I do not refer to such instances of *zeugma* as Alford has adduced in 1 Tim. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 34, where the contrasted sense of the two clauses is sufficiently indicated by the intervening *ἀλλά*; but to such expressions as 1 Tim. vi. 17, "Charge the rich . . . not to trust in the *ἀδελότητι* of riches." Surely no one needs to be charged not to trust in uncertainty, in and of itself; but the thought of the writer was on the rich, on the uncertainty of their wealth, and on the natural disposition to trust in possessions bringing with them present pleasure and power, and, by a figure which the grammarians

call *breviloquence* or *brachyology*, he puts all together in an expression which in the strict sense of the words is absurd, and which yet truly conveys his meaning more forcibly than could be done by any other form. So also in the famous passage in the same Epistle (iv. 3) *κολυόντων γαμῆν ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων*, — literally, “forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats” — the exact opposite of the plain intent of the writer. He had in mind the various directions which would be given by the false teachers; they would forbid this and command that. In the energy and brevity of his description he couples both together in regimen with a single participle, and the A. V. and the Revision alike have rightly expressed his meaning by inserting the word “*commanding* to abstain.” Many other instances of *zeugma* are cited by the grammarians: as 1 Cor. iii. 2, “I have given you to drink milk, and not meat,” where the difficulty is avoided in the A. V. and Revision by substituting “I have fed you” for *ἐπότισα*; so in Lk. i. 64, where to the Greek “His mouth was opened (*ἀνεώχθη*) and his tongue” the English has been obliged to add “loosed,” though the *zeugma* remains in the Vulgate and in all English versions before the A. V.; in the *constructio pragnans* in 1 Cor. vii. 36 the Revision by supplying the implied object in one clause, and neglecting to insert the implied subject in the other, has made the sentence (*hypallage*) even more difficult than in the A. V.; in Acts xxvii. 22 we read literally, “There shall be no loss of life except of the ship.” But it cannot be necessary to multiply instances of these familiar forms of brachyology in which the thought of the writer so glides in the course of his sentence to a different standpoint that his words, precisely construed, teach a very different thing from that which he intended to say.

It is more important to note that this general usage applies specifically to the prepositions. Without dwelling upon St. Peter's singular use of *διά* in his saying (1. iii. 20) that in the deluge the “souls were saved by (*διά*) water,” I would only refer to the note read at the last meeting of this Society by Dr. Goodwin on “The polarity of prepositions,” and quote from it a single instance of *διά* in regimen with two accusatives, expressed (as in our passage) before the first, and understood before the second, while yet it must necessarily be understood in different senses in the two cases. St. Paul exhorts Timothy (1 Tim. v. 23) to “use a little wine *διά* thy stomach and thine often infirmities,” *i.e.* to help the stomach and counteract the infirmities.

May not our passage find its explanation in this sufficiently common

habit of expression? That is to say, may not two diverse thoughts have been put together in a form which, taken precisely and *ad litteram*, is not what the writer intended to say? He speaks of the veil as that which separated man from the presence of God, he speaks of the new and living way consecrated through the veil, and he wishes to put with this the means by which it is accomplished. Just as in the previous chapter (ix. 12) he spoke of Christ's entering once for all into the Holy of holies "through His own blood," or a little further on (*ib.* 24, 26) of His having purified "the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices," even "by the sacrifice of Himself"; so here, he means to speak of Christ's having consecrated for us a way through the veil by means of His flesh sacrificed for us upon the cross. Thus the sense will be brought into entire harmony with other parts of the N. T. and especially with the teaching of this Epistle in immediate connection with our passage, and *σάρξ* will retain the meaning it always has elsewhere when used in connection with the person of our Lord. In other words, while by the exact force of the words and the precisely literal construction both genitives must be taken locally, yet really there was a gliding of the thought from one position to the other, so that while the *διὰ τοῦ καταπέτασματος* is to be taken locally, the following genitive *τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ* is to be understood instrumentally, so that the real thought of the writer is precisely that which it is impossible to allow to the exact grammatical force of his expression.

II.

ON THE REASON FOR THE SELECTION OF CERTAIN ANIMALS FOR SACRIFICE AMONG THE ANCIENT ISRAELITES.¹

It is quite commonly assumed that the selection of certain animals as allowable for offering in sacrifice among the ancient Israelites was based upon the previous recognition of these animals as suitable for human food. That which man considered suitable for his own nourishment, he thought would also be suitable for his Deity. Is this assumption founded in fact? It is a point of considerable importance, because it enters into the whole theory of sacrifices and, one way or the other, essentially modifies our view of the grounds upon which they were offered. But this question must be considered inde-

¹ Read in December.

pendently of any consequences resulting from its solution, and simply on such evidence as we can collect as to the fact.

Among other ancient nations the selection of sacrificial victims was certainly not determined by the value placed upon them for food. Some animals were used in sacrifice which were not commonly articles of food, and *vice versâ*; some were used for food which were not offered in sacrifice. For the first point: mention may be made of the horse, a conspicuous sacrificial victim among the ancients, but rarely used as food; among the Hindoos, who abstained altogether from any animal food, the horse was the pre-eminent victim, the sacrifice *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. But still more important is the fact that among almost all ancient nations, at periods when they would have utterly shrunk from cannibalism, the human victim was ever considered the highest possible sacrifice of extreme necessity. As to the second point: it is obvious that many of the less important animals were continually used for food which were hardly considered worthy of sacrificial consecration. Various birds and fish which were favorite articles of food, do not appear ever to have been offered to the gods; and of the invertebrates, though several were eaten, none seem to have been sacrificed. We may therefore confidently assume that among the heathen, however certain animals may have been commonly used for both purposes, yet this was not exclusive; the one use was not the measure and law for the other, and consequently the idea of fitness for sacrifice must have at least included some other idea than that of fitness for food; and, on the other hand, the idea of fitness for food was far more extensive than fitness for sacrifice. The two notions are not correlative.

When we turn to the Hebrew legislation on this subject there is a certain presumption that we shall find among them the same fundamental principles. In the earliest mention of sacrifice in sacred literature, after Abel's offering "of the firstlings of the flock" (Gen. iv. 4), we already find recognized the distinction of "clean" among both beasts and birds (Gen. viii. 20); while in the earliest mention of animal food (*ib.* ix. 3, 4) all such distinction is excluded and "every moving thing that liveth" is alike assigned for meat. If these two passages be taken as they stand in Genesis as it has come down to us, they were substantially contemporaneous, both being immediately after the flood and in connection with the deliverance of Noah. On the Grafian hypothesis the argument will, if possible, be still stronger, the latter passage, making no distinction between food animals, belonging to the priestly writer (*P*²), while the former, rec-

ognizing a distinction between animals fit for sacrifice, is from the Judæan narrative (J.).¹ However this may be, it is plain that both belong to the very ancient story of Noah, long before the technical distinctions of the Levitical law.

Such being the earliest state of the matter, a distinction between sacrificial animals, and none between food animals, there is nothing further upon the subject until the giving of the Levitical law is reached, except that whenever sacrifices are specified, they are always of animals recognized in that law as suitable for sacrifice. It might indeed be urged by those who maintain the priority of the Deuteronomic to the Levitical legislation, that there is already in Deut. xiv. 3-21 quite a long list of animals allowed and forbidden for food; but this will not affect the argument for two reasons: (1) Sacrifice was certainly a far more ancient institution than this law (and the later Deuteronomy is placed, the greater the disparity), while there is no trace of any other than a certain very limited class of animals being used for the purpose; and (2) the list of food animals in Deuteronomy is far more extensive in every class than the sacrificial animals (as "the hart, the roe-buck, . . . the wild ox, etc. . . . all clean birds"), and there are whole classes allowed for food, as fish, and various invertebrates, which were never used for sacrifice.

We come then to the Levitical law with a strong presumption that the distinction between animals as suitable or not for sacrifice must have rested on some other ground than their real or supposed suitability for food. This clearly was not the ground of distinction among other nations, and equally clearly it had not been among the Israelites up to the time of the giving of the Levitical law. The same thing is to be said of that law itself. There is nowhere any list of animals allowed in sacrifice, but in the law of each sacrifice it is specified of what animal or choice of animals it shall be. Among the mammalia, only the domestic animals, those of "the herd and the flock," the latter including goats as well as sheep, were allowed, and of birds the alternative of turtle doves or young pigeons. The range of food animals was far wider, and included all the wild mammalia "that part the hoof and chew the cud," numbers of birds, all fish "that have scales and fins," and several kinds of invertebrates. It is indeed true that all animals allowed in sacrifice were also permitted

¹ This apportionment of the critics is the more remarkable from the fact that the long list of clean and unclean animals in Lev. xi. is of course attributed by them to one or another of the editors of the "Priestly Codes" (P¹, P², or P³).

for food ; but this was of necessity. The greater part of almost all peace, sin, and trespass offerings were required to be eaten by the priests or people or both together ; only the whole burnt offering, the sin offerings whose blood was carried with the veil, and the "goat for Azazel" are exceptions, besides the peculiar "red heifer," and these naturally followed the analogy of the rest. While, therefore, there was good reason why all sacrificial animals should also be allowed for food, the converse was far from true, and far the larger number of food animals were not to be used in sacrifice. We may, then, pretty certainly conclude that the selection of the sacrificial animals rested upon some other ground.

When it is asked, what then probably was the ground of the selection, it seems to me we have not far to seek. Of course it must have been required in any sacrifice, whatever it might be, that the victim should belong to the offerer. This was necessary both for the personal connection of the offerer with his sacrifice, and also in deference to that universal and proper feeling so well expressed by David (2 Sam. xxiv. 24), "Neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the LORD my God of that which cost me nothing." But these two principles, necessary to be observed in all sacrifices, give no indication why one victim should have been chosen rather than another. They might even suggest that the most valuable animals would be selected. The exact opposite was the case, and constituted, it seems to me, the real ground of the selection. Those animals were required for sacrifice, and those only, which were *easiest to obtain*. As a variety was demanded, there must be some difference in this respect, but all were of domestic animals, and as the sacrifice rose in importance, the victim became more easily obtained, until in the ordinary sin offering, necessary for every one, it was the she-goat, the commonest and cheapest of all the domestic animals. In the case of birds, although the pigeon is commonly said to have been domesticated in the earliest times, I know no evidence of the fact, but, nevertheless, the same principle applied. The selection was limited to "turtle doves and young pigeons," and two of either were required, the ritual of the sacrifice being impracticable with one, by reason of their small size. The turtle dove was very gentle and easily captured, but was only to be found in abundance at certain seasons of the year. The pigeon, on the other hand, was always numerous in every part of the country, but was strong of flight and, when full grown, not easily taken. Hence the provision in this case of "*young pigeons*," or, as we say, squabs, readily captured on the nest.

Of course in the character and habits of these animals there was nothing unfitting them for their sacrificial use, and in the case of the lamb and the dove, though not in that of the bullock and the ram, there was an especial appropriateness.

If the ground of the choice of the sacrificial animals has now been rightly given, it is obvious that a broad distinction existed between the Israelite and the heathen sacrifices. Into the latter, the element of value entered largely, and in the effort to atone for offences against the gods, victims were multiplied in number and increased in cost. There was a distinct and recognized attempt to compensate the offended deity by a *quid pro quo*. Among the Israelites, while the peace offerings might be indefinitely multiplied for the purposes of the feast of communion with God, in the sin offering, the sacrifice of atonement for transgression, nothing was allowed in ordinary cases but the single she-goat, the cheapest and commonest of the domestic animals, and in case of poverty two doves might be substituted, or even in case of extreme poverty, an offering of fine flour. There was no gradation between the heinousness of the offence and the value of the offering. The sacrifice was always the same, varied only by the ability of the offerer, so that it might be within the reach of all. The idea of *compensation* was emphatically excluded, and it was made clear that the sacrifices for sin could have only a symbolic, and not an intrinsic value.

III.

THE JEW AND THE GREEK.¹

In the last publication of the "Egypt Exploration Fund," "Tanis II.," pp. 49, 50, it is shown that Defeuneh, the Tahpanhes of Jeremiah and Daphnai of the Greeks, was occupied about B.C. 600-565 by a large garrison of Greek mercenaries, with many other Greeks settled in the neighborhood. It was to this point that the fugitive Jews came after the murder of Gedaliah (Jer. xliii. 5-7); and it was here that Nebuchadnezzar found them, according to Josephus (Ant. ix. 7), and carried them to Babylon. These Jewish captives would then have been in close intercourse with the Greeks, and it is suggested that in this we have an easy explanation of the mention of Greek musical instruments in Dan. iii. There is a difficulty in this precise statement because, although Dan. iii. is not dated, presumably it relates

¹ Read in December.

to an earlier period of Nebuchadnezzar's reign than his expedition into Egypt. Nevertheless, the suggestion is valuable as giving a distinct historic instance of contact between Nebuchadnezzar and the Greek arts, and showing how easily similar contact might have occurred at earlier periods of his reign.

*The Asserted Seven-Fold Division of the Sacred Tree.*¹

BY REV. WILLIAM HAYES WARD.

IN Schrader's "Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament," p. 22, this learned author says:—

"On figured representations the number seven is clearly to be recognized. The naturalistic representation of the palm in Layard's 'Nineveh and Babylon,' VIII B, exhibits in the crown of the tree seven branches, and with this may be compared the palm with seven branches figured on a Babylonian cylinder in the *Berlin Acad. Monatsb.*, 1881, May, Plate No. 4. Moreover, in the *sacred tree*, as it is called, in the enumeration of the individual branches and leaves, it is mainly the number *seven* which predominates. This is shown even in the earliest representations of this tree on the ancient Babylonian cylinder, made known to the world by Smith, in which it is portrayed with $4 + 3 = 7$ branches, *ibid.* No. 5. Also, we observe the same feature in the later and purely schematic forms, until we come to that displayed on the Assyrian monuments, which curiously exhibits the number seven either in the branches, or in the leaves of the perianth, or in those of the crown, or in several of these together. Occasionally we likewise come across the number *ten*."

In *The Babylonian and Oriental Record*, Vol. II., No. 7, p. 150, Professor Delacouperie says to the same purport, speaking of the Sacred Tree:—

"The characteristic to which it is my purpose to call the attention of my readers is the limited number of the branches. In some instances there are twelve, six on each side, but this number does not occur often; seven, fourteen, and fifteen (if we include the top of the tree), and thirty are the usual numbers."

I desire to test the correctness of these statements by an examination of the monuments. For evidence as to the seal cylinders, it is enough to examine all the cylinders figured in the two great collections, those of De Clercq and Lajard. In the case of the former the

¹ Read in December.